

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY**

Sholom Ginsberg,
individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,
Plaintiff(s)

-v.-

Gem Recovery Systems LLC,
and John Does 1-25.

Defendant(s).

Civil Action No: 3:20-cv-20135

**CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT
DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

Plaintiff Sholom Ginsberg (“Plaintiff”), brings this Class Action Complaint by and through his attorneys, Stein Saks, PLLC, against Defendant Gem Recovery Systems LLC (“Gem”), individually and on behalf of a class of all others similarly situated, pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, based upon information and belief of Plaintiff’s counsel, except for allegations specifically pertaining to Plaintiff, which are based upon Plaintiff’s personal knowledge.

INTRODUCTION/PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

1. The Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (“FDCPA” or “Act”) was enacted in 1977 in response to the “abundant evidence of the use of abusive, deceptive, and unfair debt collection practices by many debt collectors.” 15 U.S.C. §1692(a). The Act was promulgated because of the concern that “abusive debt collection practices contribute to the number of personal bankruptcies, to material instability, to the loss of jobs, and to invasions of individual privacy.” *Id.* It concluded that “existing laws...[we]re inadequate to protect consumers,” and that “the effective collection of

debts" does not require "misrepresentation or other abusive debt collection practices." 15 U.S.C. §§ 1692(b) & (c).

2. The purpose of the Act was not only to eliminate abusive debt collection practices, but also to ensure "that those debt collectors who refrain from using abusive debt collection practices are not competitively disadvantaged." *Id.* § 1692(e). After determining that the existing consumer protection laws were inadequate, *Id.* § 1692(b), the Act gave consumers a private cause of action against debt collectors who fail to comply with the Act. *Id.* § 1692k.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

3. The Court has jurisdiction over this class action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and 15 U.S.C. § 1692 et. seq. The Court has pendent jurisdiction over state law claims, if any, in this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1337(a).

4. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331(b)(2), as a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims occurred here, Plaintiff resides here, and Defendant transacts business here.

NATURE OF THE ACTION

5. Plaintiff brings this class action on behalf of a class of consumers under Section 1692 et seq. of Title 15 of the United States Code, also known as the Fair Debt Collections Practices Act ("FDCPA"), and

6. Plaintiff is seeking damages and declaratory relief.

PARTIES

7. Plaintiff is a resident of the State of New Jersey, county of Ocean, residing at 2306 Tapestry Ct, Toms River, NJ 08755.

8. Defendant Gem is a “debt collector” as the phrase is defined in 15 U.S.C. § 1692(a)(6) and used in the FDCPA and can be served on their registered agent Frank Giglio, at 1001 McBride Ave, Woodland Park, NJ 07424-2534.

9. Upon information and belief, Defendant Gem is a company that uses the mail, telephone, and facsimile and regularly engages in business the principal purpose of which is to attempt to collect debts alleged to be due to itself or another.

10. John Does 1-25, are fictitious names of individuals and businesses alleged for the purpose of substituting names of Defendants whose identities will be disclosed in discovery and should be made parties to this action.

CLASS ALLEGATIONS

11. Plaintiff brings this claim on behalf of the following class, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a) and 23(b)(3).

12. The Class consists of all individuals:

- a. with addresses in the State of New Jersey;
- b. to whom Defendant Gem sent an initial letter;
- c. attempting to collect a consumer debt;
- d. stating that the debt may remain on the debtor’s credit report for as long as seven years; and
- e. which letter was sent on or after a date one (1) year prior to the filing of this action and on or before a date twenty-one (21) days after the filing of this action.

13. The identities of all class members are readily ascertainable from the records of Defendant and those companies and entities on whose behalf it attempts to collect and/or has purchased debts.

14. Excluded from the Plaintiff Class are the Defendant and all officers, members, partners, managers, directors and employees of the Defendant and their respective immediate families, and legal counsel for all parties to this action, and all members of their immediate families.

15. There are questions of law and fact common to the Plaintiff Class, which common issues predominate over any issues involving only individual class members. The principal issue is whether the Defendant's written communications to consumers, in the form attached as Exhibit A, violate 15 U.S.C. §§ 1692e and 1692f.

16. The Plaintiff's claims are typical of the class members, as all are based upon the same facts and legal theories. The Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Plaintiff Class defined in this complaint. The Plaintiff has retained counsel with experience in handling consumer lawsuits, complex legal issues, and class actions, and neither the Plaintiff nor his attorneys have any interests, which might cause them not to vigorously pursue this action.

17. This action has been brought, and may properly be maintained, as a class action pursuant to the provisions of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure because there is a well-defined community interest in the litigation:

- a. **Numerosity:** The Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that the Plaintiff Class defined above is so numerous that joinder of all members would be impractical.
- b. **Common Questions Predominate:** Common questions of law and fact exist as to all members of the Plaintiff Class and those questions predominate over any questions or issues involving only individual class members. The principal issue is whether the Defendant's written communications to consumers, in the form attached as Exhibit A violate 15 U.S.C. §§ 1692e and 1692f.

c. **Typicality:** The Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the class members.

The Plaintiff and all members of the Plaintiff Class have claims arising out of the Defendant's common uniform course of conduct complained of herein.

d. **Adequacy:** The Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the class members insofar as Plaintiff has no interests that are adverse to the absent class members. The Plaintiff is committed to vigorously litigating this matter. Plaintiff has also retained counsel experienced in handling consumer lawsuits, complex legal issues, and class actions. Neither the Plaintiff nor his counsel have any interests which might cause them not to vigorously pursue the instant class action lawsuit.

e. **Superiority:** A class action is superior to the other available means for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy because individual joinder of all members would be impracticable. Class action treatment will permit a large number of similarly situated persons to prosecute their common claims in a single forum efficiently and without unnecessary duplication of effort and expense that individual actions would engender.

18. Certification of a class under Rule 23(b)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure is also appropriate in that the questions of law and fact common to members of the Plaintiff Class predominate over any questions affecting an individual member, and a class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy.

19. Depending on the outcome of further investigation and discovery, Plaintiff may, at the time of class certification motion, seek to certify a class(es) only as to particular issues pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(4).

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

20. Plaintiff repeats the above allegations as if set forth here.
21. Allegedly, on or about August 30, 2019, Plaintiff incurred an obligation to a non-party identified as "MONOC".
22. This alleged debt was incurred as a financial obligation that were primarily for personal, family or household purposes and are therefore a "debt" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a (5), specifically for personal medical services.
23. Monoc is a "creditor" as defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a (4).
24. Allegedly, Monoc is Gem's client and Gem was tasked with collecting the alleged debt.
25. Defendant Gem collects and attempts to collect debts incurred or alleged to have been incurred for personal, family or household purposes on behalf of itself or other creditors using the United States Postal Services, telephone and internet.

Violation - October 1, 2020 Collection Letter

26. On or about October 1, 2020, Defendant Gem sent Plaintiff a collection letter, a copy of which is attached as Exhibit A.
27. The letter states, "It is important that you remit payment before your past due account is added to your credit record; which may impair your credit rating. Once the derogatory reporting is listed on your credit report, it may remain on a credit report for as long as seven (7) years."
28. The statement that "[o]nce the derogatory reporting is listed on your credit report, it may remain on a credit report for as long as seven (7) years." is false, deceptive, misleading, and unfair because once the derogatory report is made it cannot remain on Plaintiff's credit report for as long as seven years.

29. This is because a derogatory report remains on someone's credit report for seven years from the date of default, not from the date of reporting.

30. By the time Defendant reported the alleged debt, or would have done so, it could only remain on Plaintiff's credit report for less than seven years.

31. There is no circumstance where this debt "may remain on a credit report for as long as seven (7) years".

32. Due to Defendant's actions the consumer is confused as to how long the debt would remain on his credit report.

33. Defendant was therefore unable to evaluate his options of how to handle this debt.

34. These violations by Defendant were knowing, willful, negligent and/or intentional, and Defendant did not maintain procedures reasonably adapted to avoid any such violations.

35. Defendant's collection efforts with respect to this alleged debt from Plaintiff caused Plaintiff to suffer concrete and particularized harm, inter alia, because the FDCPA provides Plaintiff with the legally protected right to be not to be misled or treated unfairly with respect to any action for the collection of any consumer debt.

36. Defendant's deceptive, misleading and unfair representations with respect to its collection efforts were material misrepresentations that affected and frustrated Plaintiff's ability to intelligently respond to Defendant's collection efforts because Plaintiff could not adequately respond to Defendant's demand for payment of this debt.

37. Defendant's actions created an appreciable risk to Plaintiff of being unable to properly respond or handle Defendant's debt collection.

38. Plaintiff was confused and misled to his detriment by the statements in the dunning letter, and relied on the contents of the letter to his detriment.

39. Plaintiff would have pursued a different course of action were it not for the statutory violation(s).

40. As a result of Defendant's deceptive, misleading and false debt collection practices, Plaintiff has been damaged.

COUNT I
VIOLATIONS OF THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT
15 U.S.C. §1692e et seq.

41. Plaintiff repeats the above allegations as if set forth here.

42. Defendant's debt collection efforts attempted and/or directed towards the Plaintiff violated various provisions of the FDCPA, including but not limited to 15 U.S.C. § 1692e.

43. Pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1692e, a debt collector may not use any false, deceptive, or misleading representation or means in connection with the collection of any debt.

44. Defendant violated said section by:

a. falsely or deceptively stating or implying that a report of the alleged debt may remain on Plaintiff's credit report for up to seven years in violation of § 1692e (10); and

b. falsely representing the character or legal status of the debt as one that could be reported and remain on Plaintiff's credit report for up to seven years in violation of § 1692e (2)(A).

45. By reason thereof, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff for judgment that Defendant's conduct violated Section 1692e et seq. of the FDCPA, actual damages, statutory damages, costs and attorneys' fees.

COUNT II
VIOLATIONS OF THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT
15 U.S.C. §1692f et seq.

46. Plaintiff repeats the above allegations as if set forth here.

47. Defendant's debt collection efforts attempted and/or directed towards the Plaintiff violated various provisions of the FDCPA, including but not limited to 15 U.S.C. § 1692f.

48. Pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1692f, a debt collector may not use any unfair or unconscionable means in connection with the collection of any debt.

49. Defendant violated this section by unfairly stating that that a report of the alleged debt may remain on Defendant's credit report for up to seven years.

50. By reason thereof, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff for judgment that Defendant's conduct violated Section 1692f et seq. of the FDCPA, actual damages, statutory damages, costs and attorneys' fees.

DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY

51. Pursuant to Rule 38 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiff hereby requests a trial by jury on all issues so triable.

PRAAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff Sholom Ginsberg, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, demands judgment from Defendant Gem Recovery Systems LLC, as follows:

- a) Declaring that this action is properly maintainable as a Class Action and certifying Plaintiff as Class representative, and Eliyahu Babad, Esq., as Class Counsel;
- b) Awarding Plaintiff and the Class statutory damages;
- c) Awarding Plaintiff and the Class actual damages;
- d) Awarding Plaintiff costs of this Action, including reasonable attorneys' fees and expenses;
- e) Awarding pre-judgment interest and post-judgment interest; and

f) Awarding Plaintiff and the Class such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

Dated: December 22, 2020

Respectfully submitted,

Stein Saks, PLLC

By:s/ Eliyahu Babad
Eliyahu Babad, Esq.
285 Passaic Street
Hackensack, NJ, 07601
P. (201) 282-6500 x121
F. (201) 282-6501
EBabad@SteinSaksLegal.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff